

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gev

APPLICATION NO.	F	TLING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/985,793	11/06/2001		Masanori Nakamura	040679-1390	4343
22428	7590	08/16/2004		EXAMINER	
FOLEY A	ND LARI	DNER	LANGEL, WAYNE A		
SUITE 500 3000 K STR	REET NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHING	WASHINGTON, DC 20007			1754	
				DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004	•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER		
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☐ This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 7-19-5 4	
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire	rom the date of this letter.
Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:	
1	atent Drawing Review, PTO-948. at Application, PTO-152.
Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION	
1. A claims $\frac{1-3}{9}$ and $\frac{6-12}{9}$	are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims 9-11 ar	e withdrawn from consideration.
2. Claims	have been cancelled.
3. Claims	are allowed.
4. Claims 1-36-8 and 12	are rejected.
5. Claims	are objected to.
6. Claims are subject to restrict	on or election requirement.
7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for example 1.85 which are acceptable 1.85 which accepta	nination purposes.
8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.	
9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on Under 37 of are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, F	C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on has (have) been examiner; ☐ dlsapproved by the examiner (see explanation).	□approved by the
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed, has beenapproved;disapproved	(see explanation).
Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been to been filled in parent application, serial no; filed on	
13. Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	the merits is closed in
14. Other	•

Serial No. 09/985,793

1754

Art Unit

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese 9-327624. Japanese 9-327624 discloses a catalyst for purifying internal combustion engine exhaust gas wherein the catalyst comprises at least two layers comprising a catalyst layer containing rhodium, palladium, a cerium compound, and refractory inorganic oxides as catalytic components. (See the English Abstract.) Japanese 9-327624 specifically discloses in the English Abstract that the concentration of the cerium compound is preferably from 1 to 80 grams per liter of the catalyst, and that the concentration of palladium is preferably 0.1 to 15 grams per liter of the catalyst. Paragraph [0021] of the reference teaches that the outer layer contains higher amount of ceria than the inner layer. The difference between the catalyst disclosed by Japanese 9-327624, and that recited in claims 1-3, 6, 7 and 12, is that

Art Unit 1754

Japanese 9-327624 does not specifically disclose that the content of palladium should be within a range of from 1.5 to 3.0 grams per liter of catalyst. It would be prima facie obvious to employ the palladium in an amount within a range of from 1.5 to 3.0 grams per liter of the catalyst in the catalyst of Japanese 9-327624, since the reference specifically discloses that the preferred palladium range i s from 0.1 to 15 grams per liter of the catalyst, and it would be within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the amount of palladium within such range. Regarding claim 8, it would be within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art to determine a suitable difference in concentration of the cerium oxide in the two layers in the catalyst of Japanese 9-327624. Accordingly it would be prima facie obvious to provide a difference in concentration of the cerium oxide between the two layers within a range of plus or minus 10%.

The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and In re Goodman, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to

Serial No. 09/985,793

Art Unit 1754

be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d). Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 12 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of copending application Serial No. 10/315,058. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they overlap in scope with each other.

This is a *provisional* obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant is invited to make of record a certified English translation of Japanese 9-327624.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne A. Langel whose telephone number is (571) 272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8 A.M. to 3:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman, can be reached on (571) 272-1358. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit 1754

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WAL:cdc

August 10, 2004

MAYNE A. LANGEL
WAYNE A. LANGEL
TOWNARY EXAMINER